

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al. (U.S. Publication 2006/0059107) (hereinafter “Elmore”) in view of Grasso et al. (U.S. Patent 5,892,909) (hereinafter “Grasso”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest that *said form is one of a plurality of forms, and wherein each of the plurality of forms is mapped to a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing deployed upon a server computer*. The Examiner admits that Elmore does not disclose these limitations and relies on Grasso to teach them, citing column 30, lines 18-22. Grasso is directed to an Intranet-based system for delivery of information to multiple users. The system includes a wizard-like user interface that walks users through various tasks, including the updating and distribution of documents. The cited passage states, “For a data form, on the other hand, the system maps the user data into a representation suitable for the transport. For MAPI transport, for instance, user data is mapped into one or more email attachments (i.e., whatever is needed to transmit the binary data)....” In other words, this passage describes the mapping of data by a client resolver agent (CRA module 1520) into different representations suitable for transport. There is nothing in this passage, or elsewhere in the cited references, that teaches or suggests mapping each of a plurality of forms to a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing (i.e. mapping different forms to different service providers), as required by Applicants’ claim.

In remarks directed to claim 15, the Examiner admits that Elmore does not disclose a system comprising *a client computer and a server computer on which a*

plurality of providers of server-side processing are deployed. The Examiner relies on Grasso to teach these limitations, citing at least column 7, lines 21-27, which states, “Typically, IntraExpress™ would be deployed as separate IntraExpress™ server and client software components (i.e., running on separate computers), for implementing a “thin client/thick server” system.” This passage describes that the client and the server are implemented as separate components running on separate computers. It does not describe anything about a server on which a plurality of providers of server-side processing are deployed, as in Applicants’ claim. Applicants again assert that the cited references do not teach a plurality of providers of server-side processing that are mapped to respective forms, as recited in Applicants’ claims.

Further regarding claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest in response to receiving input indicating an action to be implemented on a first page, *generating, by the respective one of the plurality of providers, a second page in a high order presentation language.* As in the previous Action, the Examiner submits that Elmore teaches this limitation in at least paragraph 23, which states, “FIG. 11 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page returned to the client via HTTP.” FIG. 11 illustrates an HTML page returned to a client to display a new trouble ticket in response to a user entering information to open a trouble ticket on the sample page illustrated in FIG. 10. However, there is nothing in Elmore that describes the page illustrated in FIG. 11 being generated by a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing mapped to the form displayed in FIG. 10, as would be required by Applicants’ claim. Instead, paragraphs [0194 – 0203] describe the display of FIG. 11 as a final step in a collection of transition policy tasks that are invoked by a Web session controller to direct a user through a nested flow (a set of JSP pages) to a destination page. Applicants assert that none of the cited references describe the generation of a second page by a respective one of a plurality of providers mapped to a given one of a plurality of forms in response to input indicating an action to be taken on that form, as in Applicants’ claim.

In addition, the cited art fails to teach or suggest *wherein said generating comprises: calling a helper class method corresponding to said action.* The Examiner

admits that Elmore does not disclose this limitation and relies on Grasso to teach it in at least column 34, lines 29-46. The cited paragraph describes some of the methods (“setter” and “getter” methods) provided by a document object class, specifically, a Doc C++ class. These methods are clearly not helper class methods called by a respective service provider as part of generating a second page, as in Applicants’ claim. Applicants assert that these document object class methods teach nothing about the above-referenced limitation, which is directed to a service provider calling a helper class method as part of generating a second page in response to receiving input indicating an action to be implemented on a first page. Therefore, even if the system of Elmore were modified to include the document object class of Grasso, the combination would not teach or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention. Applicants assert that none of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the specific use of helper class methods recited in Applicants’ claim.

Applicants also assert that the cited references fail to teach or suggest *wherein said generating comprises: calling a corresponding render method*. The Examiner submits that Grasso teaches this limitation in column 34, lines 29-47. However, as discussed above, this passage describes “setter” and “getter” methods of a document object class. It teaches nothing about a render method.

Finally, Applicants assert that the cited references fail to teach or suggest *wherein at least one of said helper class method and said render method is re-usable in performing a subsequent action on a page*. The Examiner submits that Grasso teaches this limitation in at least columns 31 and 32. The cited passages describe the use and benefits of an AVLlist class. The system of Grasso uses an AVLlist to manage a higher-level list. In other words, the system maintains a linked-list of AV objects, and the AVLlist provides list processing for allowing lists of AV objects to be linked again. The cited passages describe that storing information in this way is useful because like or similar information can be stored and accessed iteratively and can be grouped in common segments in memory. **This has absolutely nothing to do with the reusable helper class method and render method of Applicants’ claim.**

The Examiner submits, “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the electronic business system of Elmore with the system and method for managing delivery of information to multiple users of Grasso because it is an efficient means for allowing users to manage the distribution and delivery of information across an enterprise Intranet, Internet, and common communication channels.” The Examiner’s stated reason to combine the references is not commensurate with the feature of Grasso he is attempting to combine with Elmore to result in the claimed invention. Applicants’ claims are not directed to managing the distribution and delivery of information to multiple users. Furthermore, the document object class methods in the system of Grasso have nothing to do with the limitations of claim 1 that are not taught by Elmore (e.g., a service provider mapped to a respective form calling a reusable helper class method to generate a second page in response to input indicating an action to be taken on a first page). In addition, as discussed above, the document object class methods of Grasso are not used in the manner recited for the helper classes in Applicants’ claims, nor is there any evidence that they would improve the efficiency of Elmore’s system, as the Examiner seems to imply. Therefore, the Examiner’s reason to combine is improper.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and were rejected together with claim 1. Therefore, the arguments presented above apply with equal force to these claims, as well.

Regarding claim 4, the cited art fails to teach or suggest *wherein each of said plurality of providers of server-side processing comprises a servlet*. The Examiner submits that Elmore discloses this limitation in at least paragraphs 103 and 156. These passages describe a web session controller that is a Java servlet. This web session controller provides load balancing services between requests in Elmore’s system. It

teaches nothing about the providers of server-side processing recited in Applicants' claims, i.e. service providers that are mapped to respective forms and that generate and provide pages in a high order presentation language.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* rejection of claim 4.

Claims 11 and 19 include limitations similar to those of claim 4 discussed above, and were rejected together with claim 4. Therefore, the arguments presented above apply with equal force to these claims, as well.

Applicants assert that numerous other ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. Applicants traverse the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons given above in regard to the claims from which they depend. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-91000/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: November 20, 2009